

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

BRAD LEE PRUETT,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. CIV-11-1361-F
	)	
JUSTIN JONES, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**ORDER**

This action seeks habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner appears *pro se*, and his pleadings are liberally construed.

Magistrate Judge Gary M. Purcell entered his Supplemental Report and Recommendation in this matter on November 29, 2011, recommending that the petition be dismissed upon filing as untimely. (Doc. no. 8). Petitioner has filed an objection to the magistrate judge's recommended findings and conclusions. (Doc. no. 9.) The court reviews objected to matters *de novo*.

Having considered petitioner's objections, the court concurs with the magistrate judge's determinations and concludes that it would not be useful to cite any additional arguments or authorities.


The Supplemental Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Gary M. Purcell is **ACCEPTED, ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED** in its entirety. Accordingly, the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED** upon filing as untimely.

Petitioner is entitled to a certificate of appealability only upon making a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This standard is satisfied by demonstrating that the issues movant seeks to raise are deserving of further proceedings, debatable among jurists of reasons, or subject to

different resolution on appeal. *See, Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (“[W]e give the language found in §2253(c) the meaning ascribed it in [*Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)], with due note for the substitution of the word ‘constitutional.’”). “Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits,...[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Id.* When a prisoner’s habeas petition is dismissed on procedural grounds without reaching the merits of the prisoner’s claims, “a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Id.*

Petitioner has not made the requisite showing and a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2011.

  
STEPHEN P. FRIOT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE